DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 800 EA 032 779

AUTHOR	Sharp, William L.; Malone, Bobby G.; Walter, James K.
TITLE	What Motivates Someone To Become a Superintendent?
PUB DATE	2002-10-18
NOTE	17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (Columbus, OH, October 16-19, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Change; *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Behavior; *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Responsibility; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Leadership; Managerial Occupations; *Occupational Information; *Superintendents

ABSTRACT

This report describes a study that examined the superintendency in American public schools. It begins with an overview of the current state of the superintendency, focusing on the pressures of the job, the high turnover rate among superintendents, and the lack of qualified candidates to fill openings. The report continues with a brief review of the literature, noting that the literature is not clear concerning job satisfaction and motivational features of the superintendency. The report concludes with the results of a survey of a selected sample of superintendents in Illinois (46), Indiana (20), and Texas (53). The superintendents were asked what motivated them to become a superintendent. They were given 13 statements as possible reasons for their motivation to become a superintendent. Of the 13 statements, the one most chosen (by 95 percent of those surveyed) was "I thought I could make a difference." The least chosen statement (by 12.8 percent) was "I had paid my dues." Regarding job satisfaction, 41.2 percent of the superintendents surveyed said that their job satisfaction was "very high"; 1.6 percent rated their job satisfaction as "low" or "very low." (Contains 21 references.) (WFA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 479 800

What Motivates Someone to Become A Superintendent?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

William L. Sharp

Bobby G. Malone

Teachers College, Ball State University

James K. Walter

Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Sharp

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Presented at the Annual Meeting

Mid-Western Educational Research Association

Columbus, Ohio, October 18, 2002

EA 032 779

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What Motivates Someone to Become A Superintendent?

INTRODUCTION

The superintendency is a career position that is filled with challenges and opportunities. The leader of a school district links with the past, present, and future through our nation's greatest resource -- its people. Superintendents of public school districts hold one of the toughest jobs in the nation. Superintendents are the education leaders and the main link between their respective districts and communities (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000). The clamor for school reform, a sharp focus on accountability, and an urgent imperative for blending managerial and progressive leadership, have made the superintendent an enticing target for criticism. In the past, the job was structured and predictable because schools were required to maintain the status quo. The job today demands the superintendent to be a change agent who is constantly adapting to a myriad of social, economic and political conditions (Malone, 1999).

Portrayal of the superintendency in the professional literature seems to have a focus on the negative aspects of the job. There are individuals who seek the position, individuals who derive feelings of accomplishment from the position, and individuals who, at the end of their life's work, indicate they would seek the position again if given the opportunity. There are aspects of the job that motivate aspiring administrators to accept the challenges of the position. Unfortunately, in a time of crisis when the applicant pool is low and the quality of the candidates is questionable, there is little in the literature that can be used as positive features to attract candidates.

Expectations for superintendents are unrealistically high, and while the expectations of the job are soaring, there are fewer people who want the job (Chaddock, 1999). Reasons for the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

drop-off in applications include "the total pressure of the job." Superintendents are expected to work actively to transform, restructure, and redefine schools, yet they hold an organizational position that is historically and traditionally committed to resisting change and maintaining stability. Consequently, superintendents are quitting, being dismissed, or retiring early because they have failed to deliver the quick educational fixes demanded of them (Daley, 1990; Scherer, 1995). Those who remain take on a determined outlook that somehow, some way, they will see their programs through and ultimately prevail.

The present shortage of candidates to fill superintendent positions, the increasing demand for reform, and the painful thrust imposed on superintendents to provide ready solutions seldom contain considerations of the superintendent's performance in the context of managing scarce resources. Reasons associated with the high turnover rate among school superintendents include financial problems in the district (including budget cuts), low salaries, and inadequate staffing (Scherer, 1995). The high turnover rate is complicated by a shortage of administrative candidates for leadership positions in schools (Houston, 1998). It is further complicated by the shortage of minorities and women.

The editor of the American School Board Journal wrote that "no recent year has seen such wholesale changes in superintendents and other higher school positions as the present year. In the Middle-west, there has been a perfect storm of unrest culminating in wholesale resignations, dismissals, and new appointments." (Callahan, 1962, p. 54, as quoted in Sharp &Walter, 1997, p. 16). The year of this Journal quotation was 1913, so superintendent tenure is not a new issue. A study in Wisconsin examined the length of service of 1,528 superintendents over a 32-year period. This study concluded that the median years in one location (as superintendent) was four years, with a mean career length of seven years (Campbell, 1990, p.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

249). The tenure of school superintendents, especially in urban districts, is getting shorter. In the decade of the 90s, the media reported the tenure of urban superintendents as two-and-one-half years. However, in 1992, Glass reported that most superintendents spent 15 years in the position in no more than three districts and that about three-quarters of them had retained their jobs for five or six years (Glass, 1992). In the 2000 study, Glass, Bjork & Brunner analyzed the tenure of a superintendent by dividing the total number of years a person had served in the superintendency by the number of superintendencies the person had held. The process yielded a figure of five to six years per district served. Successful superintendents know the value of continuity in leadership. Those who have been successful usually find ways of maintaining their leadership capacity over extended periods of time, and this enables them to complete the task at hand. Perseverance of the leader during times of crises enables him/her to experience the satisfaction of task completion, a sense of accomplishment, and the feeling of a contribution made.

Years ago, an author who only identified himself as a Veteran Fighter in the Field of American Education made the following statement, as quoted by Callahan (1962):

> The point I wish to make is that nothing, absolutely nothing, is of more vital consuming interest to the average superintendent than the tremendously important question of whether he will be retained in his present position for the coming year…He knows from statistics, observations and experiences that he is in the most hazardous occupation known to insurance actuaries. Deep sea diving and structural steel work have nothing on the business of school superintending. Lloyds will insure the English clerk against rain on his week-end vacation, but no gambling house would be sufficiently reckless to bet on the chances of re-election for school superintendents three years or even two years

ahead (p. 205)

The preceding paragraphs lead one to conclude that the superintendency is a thankless and impossible job; however, there seems to be some evidence that superintendents view the position differently. Superintendents indicate that they gain a great deal of satisfaction from their jobs. In 1992, Glass reported sixty-one percent of the superintendents felt a "considerable" fulfillment in their jobs. Eight years later, Glass reported the "considerable" figure as fifty-six percent with thirty-four percent reported feeling "moderate fulfillment or satisfaction." While the figure is down, fifty-six percent is still high when one considers the stress levels of the job (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000). In a 1999 study, over fifty percent of the superintendents who responded in Indiana reported their job as "very rewarding" and almost forty percent reported it as "somewhat rewarding" (Malone, 1999). And, two-thirds of the superintendents in Glass, Bjork & Brunner's 2000 study indicated they would choose the superintendency again as a profession. What is there about the position that would account for such a high endorsement?

To be sure, serious challenges face the superintendency. There is a preponderance of evidence that the superintendency of the latter part of the twentieth century has not attracted the pool of human resources that is required to man the nation's schools. Why? As city leaders search for educators to solve a host of urgent problems (problems that the school system was not designed, nor prepared to combat), the tenure of its stewards is dwindling (Starr, 1991). The increasing demand for superintendents is caused by factors that are not directly related to professional manpower shortage; rather, it deals with the complex politics of the position and the unrealistic expectations of the job in the face of scarce resources. "We are making it harder to judge whether superintendents are doing a good job, because we're constantly expanding expectations" (Hess, 1999). Such expectations have contributed to the high turnover rate in the superintendency (Lindsay, 1994; Renchler, 1992). Can the high turnover rate be interpreted to

superintendency (Lindsay, 1994; Renchler, 1992). Can the high turnover rate be interpreted to the risk taker as a challenge, and, can such problems become motivational factors for those who would risk failure in resolving them?

Notwithstanding the problems and challenges facing the superintendency, there are positive aspects of the job. The high degree of job satisfaction that superintendents report can only be accounted for by factors, issues or challenges that are viewed as positive, not negative. The intent of this study was to survey superintendents to determine those aspects of the job that account for the high degree of job satisfaction and the high number of superintendents who indicate they would choose the superintendency again if given the opportunity. What's right about the superintendency and what motivates one to pursue the position as a career? The literature provides many negative features, yet most of the individuals who perform the job every day do not view their job in a negative way at all.

THE PROBLEM

Leadership is inextricably tied to the success of any school district, and competition for the best and brightest who would lead a school district is keen. The picture of the superintendency as an impossible or undesirable profession damages the aspirations of those who would seek such an important position. There is evidence to indicate the negative picture that is painted in the literature is simply inaccurate. If the superintendency contains so many negative features, why do superintendents report high degrees of job satisfaction and recommend their chosen profession to those who would follow? While superintendents might agree with the negative features of their job as reported in the literature, are the features so daunting as to convince one to leave or not recommend the position to aspiring administrators? What motivates one to become a

superintendent? The professional literature is not clear concerning job satisfaction and motivational features of the superintendency.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A good sound relationship between the superintendent and board of education is critical to success in the superintendency. This relationship is "crucial, not only for the job security of the superintendent, but also for the efficient management of the school district" (Sharp & Walter, 1997, p. 89). Glass (1992) reported that superintendents who were fired and/or encouraged to resign usually did so when their personal relationships with the school board broke down. Personal relationships become strained when individual board members have personal agenda that may or may not promote the overall good of the district. A reason for the high turnover in the superintendency is an increase in single board issue members who get elected only to get a teacher fired or to press a narrow agenda (Chaddock, 1999).

Giles (1990) reported 85 percent of the superintendents who experienced "involuntary turnover," cited a conflicting political agenda of the board as a major concern for their leaving. Metzger (1997) corroborated Giles' finding and added another--the conflicting political agenda of individual board members. Situations described under this theme included frequent board member turnover, power struggles among members of the board, disagreements over roles and responsibilities between the board and superintendent or among board members, conflicting priorities, or differences concerning community culture. Other factors highlighted were financial problems in the district, union problems, and collective bargaining issues (Scherer, 1995). While superintendents rank their problems with the board as a barrier to entering the superintendency and a negative aspect of the job, many superintendents view their relationships with their board

as a source of greatest support (Malone, 1999). Superintendents who articulate a clear vision for the direction they want the school district to go usually enjoy good working relationships with their board. Consistent board support leads to extended years of service from the superintendent. and continuity of leadership is an essential ingredient in school success. Good superintendent/ school board relations constitute one of the most attractive features of a given superintendency. On the other hand, controversies between the superintendent and the school board tend to be one of the most serious features that detract from a vacant superintendent's position (Cox & Malone, 2001).

Interestingly, salaries and fringe benefits have not been a major factor in determining attraction to the superintendency. Although low salaries have been cited as a reason for change of assignment, it has been limited to change in districts and not the career. In fact, studies show that superintendents now earn satisfactory pay especially in large, urban districts (Kowalski, 1999).

A significant trend in the operation of schools is the power shift to more decision-making at the local school level. This trend has changed the way schools are governed and how resources are managed. The superintendent is called upon to provide a different kind of leadership in which he/she must work more closely with building level administrators to manage and lead the school district. Such a change in leadership philosophy entails more precision in personnel selection, more expertise in collaborative leadership and more involvement of personnel, namely teachers, who have not been trained traditionally in school governance. Is the prospect of becoming a change agent a motivator for going into the superintendency or moving from one superintendency to another?

The philosophy of involving personnel in decision-making at the level most affected by the decision seems crucial. It also represents a significant shift from the traditional brokering of power

to the sharing of power with constituencies who traditionally have not sought the power nor accepted it responsibly when such empowerment was offered. Shared governance is one of the primary mainstays of educational reform: however, in the heyday of high stakes testing, the professional literature offers little evidence linking shared governance to increased student achievement.

The clamor for school accountability is at the heart of school reform. New Indiana legislation commonly called the "accountability bill" (P. L. 221) represents a commitment of the state to follow the trend towards site-based decision-making. Candidates aspiring to the superintendency need sound preparation in collaborative decision making and staff development techniques for empowering teachers, while at the same time possessing the skills for negotiating successfully with hostile teacher unions. The concept of shared governance with the individual school's improvement committee and the principal of the school calls for tremendous change. Change is a motivator for some people in the superintendency, yet for these individuals change has become a familiar commodity in their job.

METHODOLOGY

The design of the study called for survey methodology. The members of the Indiana Public School Study Council, a group of 25 school superintendents, were asked to write out what they liked about being a superintendent. These responses were then edited and formed the basis for the statements placed in the survey that was used in this study. The primary data source for the study came from a selected sample of the superintendents in Indiana, Illinois and Texas. The names and addresses were obtained from official lists from state departments of education and/or superintendent

organizations in the three states. Surveys were mailed to a 15% sample of the superintendents in each of the three states with instructions for the participants to return the surveys via enclosed self-addressed stamped envelopes.

All data entered into the database were processed anonymously and reported in aggregate form. This process allowed the researchers to report the data in such a way that individual participants were not identified. Participants had been assured of confidentiality in a letter that introduced the study and encouraged participation.

In Illinois, 46 of 100 surveyed superintendents responded for a return rate of 46%; in Indiana, 20 of 40 superintendents responded for a rate of 50%; and, in Texas, 53 of 100 returned surveys for a rate of 53%. The data were subjected to a frequency analysis using SPSS 10.0 for Windows at Teachers College, Ball State University.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The superintendents who were surveyed were asked this question: "What motivated you to become a superintendent in the first place?" They were given 13 statements as possible reasons for their motivation to become a superintendent and asked to rate each statement from one to five, where "1" meant a weak motivator for seeking the superintendency and "5" meant a very strong motivator. Of the 13 statements available for them to choose, the one that received the highest percentage of 4 and 5 responses was the following:

"I thought I could make a difference." (rated as either 4 or 5 by 95.0% of the superintendents)

The statement that had the second highest percentage for 4 or 5 was

"The job would allow me to help move the district forward." (91.5%) The third highest motivator for the superintendents was:

"The job would enable me to provide leadership." (90.7%) The next two motivators were:

"The job would give me a broader span of influence than I had in a classroom situation or in a building level position." (88.1%)

"I wanted to be all that I could be (self-actualization.)" (83.0%)

The statements that received the lowest percentage – the least motivators – were as follows:

"I had 'paid my dues'." (12.8% rated this a 4 or a 5)

"The job would enable me to live in a certain area." (20.4%)

"I thought I would like working with the people in the office." (32.2%)

"Other superintendents I knew or worked for seemed to enjoy their work." (33.9%)

"I thought I could do a better job than I had seen done before." (59.3%)

The three statements "in the middle," neither high motivators or low motivators, were as follows:

"The job was a logical progression in my career " (80.6%)

"I wanted to go beyond the building administrator level." (74.6%)

"The job would provide me financial security." (61.0%)

Looking at the strong motivators for these superintendents, it is obvious that they wanted to make a difference by using their leadership to move a school district forward. They were not highly motivated by salary, nor did they feel that they were "owed" the job, or that the job would take them to a certain community.

A year ago, the same researchers (Malone, Sharp, & Walter, 2001) asked school principals what motivated them to become principals, using the similar motivators. The top two motivators for the principals were "I thought I could make a difference" and "The job would enable me to provide leadership." These responses parallel those of the superintendents. The low rated motivators for the principals were: "The job would allow me to live in a certain area," "I had paid my dues," and "The job would provide me with financial security." Again, these are similar to the results from the superintendents.

Both groups of school leaders look outward to the job itself and the desire to accomplish something in their positions; they do not look inward for personal rewards or satisfactions, though both may ultimately come if they are successful in making the difference that they mention as their top motivator.

People who work with superintendents on a regular basis or hear them speak at meetings and conferences know that they are very dedicated educators whose primary objective is to improve the educational experiences of the students in their districts. These perceptions are congruent with the selections of the responding superintendents as to what motivated them to seek the superintendency.

Since the public perception of the superintendent is a person who is constantly under fire and almost trapped in a thankless job that no one would ever seek, we asked

these superintendents about their job satisfaction. Overall, 41.2% said that their job satisfaction was "very high," with another 45.4% saying it was "high." Thus, 86.6% rated their overall job satisfaction as high or very high. At the other end, only 1.6% rated their job satisfaction as "low" or "very low." And, when asked if they had it all over to do again, would they become superintendents, 93.2% said that they would choose their positions again. It is true that superintendents are under fire, and it is true that sometimes it is a thankless job. But, these superintendents do not feel trapped in this position. They are very satisfied with the job and would choose it again. These figures are very similar to the responses from the principals in the 2001 survey when 95.1% said that they would choose the principalship again, and 92% rated their overall job satisfaction as "high" or "very high."

In a previous research paper titled "What's Right About the School Superintendency?" (Sharp, Malone, and Walter, 2001), we said that there was "a great deal" right about it (according to the responses from the superintendents in that study). Superintendents feel that they can make a substantial impact in the district in teaching and learning and impact the education of children. There is a great satisfaction in being able to have that feeling, and that satisfaction carries over to the overall rating of their job satisfaction and their strong statement that they would do it all over again if given a chance. This should be good news for people considering a career in the superintendency: Do not be put off by some of the negative aspects of the job. They are real, of course, but the positive aspects far outweigh these negative aspects, and they also are important contributions to education and to American society. Superintendents are motivated to become superintendents for the "right" reasons: to make a difference in the

DEMOGRAPHICS:

The superintendents had been in education for a mean of 28.2 years, ranging from six to 51 years, and in the superintendency itself for a mean of 8.7 years, ranging from one to 41 years. Also, 39.1% have four or fewer years as a superintendent.

Of the superintendents responding, 87.3% were male with 12.7% female, which is similar to the percentages found in other studies.

When asked about the district size in student enrollment, 34.5% had 1000-2499 students, 26.9% had under 500 students, 19.3% had 500-999 students, 9.2% had 2500-3999 students, 5.9% had over 6000 students, and 4.2% had 4000-6000 students.

In terms of age, 44.1% were 51-55 years of age, 19.5% were 56-60, 12.7% were 46-50, 11.0% were 41-45, 5.1% were 61-65, 5.1% were 36-40, 1.7% were under 35, and 0.8% were over 65. When asked if they were eligible to retire with full benefits today, 39.0% said that they were, and 61% replied negatively.

While superintendents are perceived as quite mobile, it did not extend much out of their own state. Of those responding, 84.9% said that all of their teaching experience was in the state where they were now living, and 89.9% said that all of their administrative experience was in that same state. This was a first superintendency for 61.3% of the superintendents, a second superintendency for 26.9%, a third for 8.4%, a fourth for 1.7%, and a sixth for 1.7%. (No one noted a fifth superintendency.)

REFERENCES

Callahan, R.E. (1962). Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, R.F., LL. Cunningham, R.O. Nystrand, and M.D. Usdan. (1990). The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Co.

Chaddock, G. R. (1999). In U.S. education: The buck stops here. Christian Science Monitor. 91(41).

Cubberley, E. P. (1922). Public School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Cox. E. P. & Malone, B. G. (2001, July). Making the right choice: What board presidents say about hiring a superintendent. American School Board Journal, 188(7). 40-41.

Daley, S. (1990). School chiefs dropping out, plagued by urban problems. (cover story) New York Times. 140(48461).

Giles, Sharon & Douglas, (1990). Superintendent turnover: Crisis facing California school districts. ERIC Document ED 325981.

Glass, T. E. (1992). The 1992 study of the American school superintendency. Arlington, Va: American Association of School Administrators. Arlington, VA.

Glass, T. E., Bjork, L. & Brunner, C.C. (2000). The 2000 study of the American supintendency: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium. American Association of School Administrators. Arlington, VA.

Hess, F. (1999). Job seekers say you learn a lot about superintendent searches. American School Board Journal. 176(5), 39.

Houston, P.D. (1998). The ABCs of administrative shortages. Education Week, 17 (38), 44.

Kowalski, T. J. (1999). The School Superintendent: Theory, Practice and Cases. Upper Saddle River, NJ. Merrill/Prentice-Hall.

Lindsay, D. (1994). Turnover rate among state chiefs on the upswing. Education Week. 14(12).

Malone, B. G. (December, 1999). Barriers to Entering the Superintendency. Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, Indianapolis, IN.

Malone, B. G., Sharp, W. L., & Walter, J. K. (2001). What's right about the principalship? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, October 26, 2001.

Metzger, C. (1997) Involuntary turnover of superintendents. Thrust for Educational Leadership.

Renchler, R. (1992). Urban superintendent turnover: The need for stability. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 546).

Scherer, R. (1995). Big city school superintendents are posting high dropout rates. Christian Science Monitor. 87(142).

Sharp, W. L., & J. K. Walter. (1997). The School Superintendent: The Profession and the Person. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing.

Sharp, W. L., B. G. Malone, & J. K. Walter. (2001). What's right about the school superintendency? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, October 25, 2001.

Starr, M. (1991). Miracle workers wanted. Newsweek, 117(2).

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM034758

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: What Motivates Someone to Become a Superintendent?	
Author(s): William L. Sharp & Bobby G. Malone	
Corporate Source: Ball State University	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: W. L. Sharp	Printed Name/Position/Title: William L Sharp, Professor
Organization/Address: Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306-0590	Telephone: 765-285-8482 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: Date: 1/27/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)